



THE USE OF THE TERMS RELIGION, SPIRITUALITY, AND FAITH
IN ARMY LEADERSHIP DOCTRINE:
EVOLUTION AND CHANGE (1951 - 1997)




A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE



by



JAMES E. HILLEARY, MAJ, USA
B.S., Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1982



Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1997

AD BELLUM

PACE PAX

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19971124 106

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED
	6 June 1997	Master's Thesis 14 Aug 96 - 6 Jun 97
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE		5. FUNDING NUMBERS
The Use of the Terms Religion, Spirituality, and Faith in Army Leadership Doctrine: Evolution and Change (1951 - 1997)		
6. AUTHOR(S)		
Major James E. Hilleary, U.S. Army		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027-1352		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited		DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)		
This study reviews U.S. Army leadership doctrine published during the period 1951 to 1990 and presently emerging in 1997. It focused on the Army's change in the use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as printed in the Army Field Manual (FM) series 22-10 and 22-100. To compare the manuals, the investigator identified the frequency with which the terms religion, spirituality, and faith appeared in each FM. Additionally, he utilized a context analysis and content assessment to determine each manual's message regarding religion, spirituality, and faith. The author's of the FM 22-100 series changed the frequency of their term-use considerably. These changes alone, however, did not offer substantial insight into the Army's messages regarding religion, spirituality and faith. The investigator determined from the context analysis and content assessment that from 1951 to 1983 the Army primarily instructed leaders to support some aspect of their own or their subordinates' religion, spirituality, or faith. This trend began to change in 1990 when FM 22-100 decreased the emphasis on religion and spirituality. In 1997, the emerging FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) changed the context and content patterns by disassociating Army values from religious values and emphasizing the private nature of subjects choice.		
14. SUBJECT TERMS		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 88
Religion, Spirituality, Faith, Leadership, Doctrine		16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified
20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified		

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to **stay within the lines** to meet **optical scanning requirements**.

Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered.

State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit
	Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement.

Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

DOE - See authorities.

NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.

DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.

NASA - Leave blank.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (*Maximum 200 words*) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (*NTIS only*).

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.

THE USE OF THE TERMS RELIGION, SPIRITUALITY, AND FAITH
IN ARMY LEADERSHIP DOCTRINE:
EVOLUTION AND CHANGE (1951 - 1997)

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

by

JAMES E. HILLEARY, MAJ, USA
B.S., Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, 1982

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
1997

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.


MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE


Name of Candidate: MAJ James E. Hilleary

Thesis Title: The Use of the Terms Religion, Spirituality, and Faith in Army Leadership Doctrine: Evolution and Change (1951 - 1997)

Approved by:

 _____, Thesis Committee Chairman
Chaplain (LTC) Ronald R. Huggler, M.A.

 _____, Member
LTC Edwin L. Kennedy, M.A., M.M.A.S.

 _____, Member
LTC (Ret.) George B. Kuykendall, Ph.D.

 _____, Member, Consulting Faculty
COL Judith A. Bowers, Ph.D.

Accepted this 6th day of June 1997 by:

 _____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Philip J. Brookes, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

THE USE OF THE TERMS RELIGION, SPIRITUALITY, AND FAITH IN ARMY
LEADERSHIP DOCTRINE: EVOLUTION AND CHANGE (1951 - 1997) by MAJ
James E. Hilleary, USA, 88 pages.

This study reviews U.S. Army leadership doctrine published during the period 1951 to 1990 and presently emerging in 1997. It focused on the Army's change in the use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as printed in the Army Field Manual (FM) series 22-10 and 22-100.

To compare the manuals, the investigator identified the frequency with which the terms religion, spirituality, and faith appeared in each FM. Additionally, he utilized a context analysis and a content assessment to determine each manual's message regarding religion, spirituality, and faith.

The authors of the FM 22-100 series changed the frequency of their term-use considerably. These changes alone, however, did not offer substantial insight into the Army's messages regarding religion, spirituality, and faith. The investigator determined from the context analysis and content assessment that from 1951 to 1983 the Army primarily instructed leaders to support some aspect of their own or their subordinates' religion, spirituality, or faith. This trend began to change in 1990 when FM 22-100 decreased the emphasis on religion and spirituality. In 1997, the emerging FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) changed the context and content patterns by disassociating Army values from religious values and emphasizing the private nature of religious choice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge that this paper and its associated research reflect capabilities provided to me by God and developed in accordance with His plan. I hope that He is pleased with my effort. I also wish to acknowledge my wife, Susan, for her continuing support throughout the period of this study. Her encouragement assured me that completion was always “just in sight” and that I had it in me to reach the objective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
GENERAL.....	1
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
ARMY DOCTRINE.....	12
ARMY LEADERSHIP DOCTRINE	12
HISTORICAL EXAMPLES.....	19
CORPORATE CONCEPTS	20
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	23
4. FINDINGS.....	27
FREQUENCY ANALYSIS	27
CONTEXT ANALYSIS AND CONTENT ASSESSMENT	28
CONTEXT ANALYSIS AND CONTENT ASSESSMENT NARRATIVE	31
5. DISCUSSIONS WITH DOCTRINE AUTHORS AND EDITORS, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	65
DISCUSSIONS WITH DOCTRINE AUTHORS AND EDITORS	65
SUMMARY	68
CONCLUSIONS.....	70
IMPLICATIONS.....	72
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY	78
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST.....	82

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Term use Classifications	24
2. Term-use Frequency	27
3. Context Classification.....	29
4. Total Frequency of Answered Content Delineating Questions.....	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

General

Purpose

This research studies U.S. Army leadership doctrine published in Army field manuals (FMs) from 1951 to 1990 as well as emerging doctrine. The intent was to answer the question how has Army leadership doctrine changed its use of the terms religion, religious, spirit, spiritual, spirituality, and faith (hereafter addressed as religion, spirituality, and faith) during the study period.

This paper records the investigator's analysis of the U.S. Army's leadership manuals FM 22-10 and FM 22-100 printed from 1951 to 1990. It also documents the same analysis of the 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) proposed for release in Army fiscal year 1998. The investigator's intent was to identify changes and trends in the manner with which the Army used the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in its leadership doctrine. This study provides a brief overview of the Army's FM 22-100 series manuals, both the manuals already published and the one proposed for publication. This summary outlines changes in Army leadership philosophies and styles that will help the reader understand the Army's changes in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith. The investigator also included historical information related to religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership. These quotations of past leaders and extracts from military documents offer insight into the Army's tradition of associating religion, spirituality, and faith, with

leadership. For the purpose of providing a comparative perspective, this paper also includes three brief discussions of spirituality as an element of civilian corporate leadership and management.

The investigator, having read both the 1983 and 1990 editions of FM 22-100, noted a change in the Army's use of the terms religion and spirituality. The 1990 edition, in comparison to the 1983 edition, omitted the term spiritual and decreased its use of the term religion. These changes suggested to the investigator that the Army was diminishing its emphasis on religion, spirituality, and faith as leadership elements, perhaps for the purpose of secularizing FM 22-100. The changes also piqued the investigator's interest regarding the Army's traditional regard for matters of religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership. Knowing that historical military leaders, namely George Washington and Robert E. Lee, had associated religion and prayer with leadership, the investigator wondered what the Army, as an institution, had historically published addressing the issue.

Background: Religion, Spirituality, and Faith

During the period 1951 to 1990, the Army published eight military leadership manuals using the FM 22-10 or FM 22-100 series designators. All eight publications mentioned one of the terms: religion, spirituality, or faith. Each revised manual had an editorial change, albeit sometimes minor, relating to the focus of this research effort. These changes differentiated each subsequent release from its superseded edition.

During the decade 1950-1959, the Army published one edition of FM 22-10 and two of FM 22-100. All three manuals briefly mentioned religion in the context of an action a leader should take to enhance the spiritual welfare of his soldiers. During the 1960s, the Army published two editions of FM 22-100 and increased the amount of text that addressed religion and spirituality. Neither publication used the term faith. The single FM 22-100 published during the

1970s continued the common message of the previous editions, support religious activities, but also explained the importance of religious values. The FM 22-100 printed in 1983 addressed religion and faith using historical combat vignettes. The FM's authors also introduced the concept of a soldier's higher-level needs of spirit and soul. In 1990, the Army deleted the explanation of spirit and soul as higher-level needs and reprinted edited vignettes. The term religion, although present in the text of the 1990 FM 22-100, appeared with decreased frequency. The singular use of the term faith remained in print as previously published in 1983. The 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) is a proposed guide for all military and civilian leaders in the Army. It addresses the leadership aspects common to leaders at all levels as well as the leadership aspects unique to senior leaders. The 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) is similar to the 1951 FM 22-10 in that it consolidates information previously published in several different leadership FMs.

Delimitations

The investigator researched U.S. Army leadership doctrine only. He did not consider the leadership doctrine published by the US's other armed services, the U.S. Joint Staff, or doctrine written by the military leaders of other countries. The investigator's inclusion of quotations of historical and corporate leaders serves only to provide background information or a comparative perspective for considering this research.

Examination of religion, spirituality, or faith as each relates to ethics and or values is beyond the scope of this study. This study's research focus was the Army's changes in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in leadership doctrine. The investigator recorded each use of these terms as they appeared in the FM 22-100 discussions of Army ethics and values. This paper does not argue that the Army should base its ethics and values on religious values, nor does it endorse any religion's values. However, the Army in its emerging doctrine emphatically

disassociates Army values from religious values. The investigator was not able to discuss the emerging doctrines' term-use context without addressing both Army values and religious values.

The investigator's research did not address terms other than specific uses of or implied references to religion, religious, spirit, spiritual, or spirituality, and faith.

Importance

The importance of this of this research is the identification and description of the changing nature of Army leadership doctrine relating to its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith. Specifically, it provides the reader with evidence that the Army is evolving away from the inclusion of religion, spirituality, and faith as aspects of leading and leadership. This paper will serve as a reference for future discussions regarding the inclusion of religion, spirituality, or faith in Army leadership doctrine. The inclusion of religion, spirituality, and faith in a list of leadership elements stirs debate within the Army. Some people believe that the Army should not address religion, spirituality, or faith in leadership doctrine; others argue otherwise. The intent in conducting this research was to identify and describe useful information relating to discussion of the issue.

The investigator selected this topic after noting that the FM 22-100 printed in 1990 decreased the frequency of use of the terms religion and spiritual when compared with the 1983 publication. These following questions prompted his research topic selection:

1. Do these term-use changes indicate the Army's intent to secularize FM 22-100?
2. What has the Army traditionally written regarding religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership?

The investigator, knowing it would be impossible or at best impractical to contact the authors of each leadership FM; decided to conduct a descriptive review of each release of FM 22-10 and FM 22-100. The results from the literature review indicate that almost all of the

publications in the FM 22-100 series differ in the manner and extent to which they used the terms religion, spirituality, and faith.

The literature review and associated discussions suggested that this study would be unique. Other military research papers and publications had discussed religion, spirituality, and faith as an aspect of Army ethics or values. The investigator did not locate any other research that studied changes in the Army's use of terms religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of Army leadership doctrine.

This study was timely. In April 1997 the Army's proponents of FM 22-100 at Fort Leavenworth released the latest revision of FM 22-100 as an initial draft. Purportedly, officers involved with writing or approving doctrine debated the manner and extent to which leadership doctrine should discuss religion, spirituality, and faith.

Research Questions

Primary

How has U.S. Army leadership doctrine changed in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith since 1951?

Subordinate

1. What is the frequency of use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the Army's FM 22-100 series publications between 1951 and 1997?
2. What is the Army's context and content for each use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the FM 22-100 series between 1951 and 1997?

Assumptions

1. Army leaders who are aware of their subordinates' religious beliefs will act to facilitate their subordinates' expression or practice of religion, spirituality, or faith.
2. The existing chaplain's manuals (FM 16 series) do not adequately inform *leaders* how to provide for their subordinates' expression of religion, spirituality, and faith.
3. Most Army commissioned officers and non-commissioned officers are not familiar with the contents of the chaplain's FM 16 series publications.
4. Army leaders will not research the FM 16 series publications for advice regarding religion spirituality, or faith if the Army removes these topics from FM 22-100.
5. Subordinates prefer leaders conversant with religion, spirituality, and faith over leaders who are not conversant with religion, spirituality, or faith.
6. Army commissioned officers and non-commissioned officers recognize a subordinate's choice not to be religious or spiritual and will not deliberately act to infringe on that choice.
7. Army officers and non-commissioned officers lead in accordance with the tenets of Army leadership doctrine.
8. The Army's deletion of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith in leadership doctrine constitutes a tacit endorsement Humanism.
9. A generic reference to religion, spirituality, or faith in leadership doctrine can increase leader awareness of the importance of religion, spirituality, or faith to subordinates.
10. Army leaders with strong religious, spiritual, or faith convictions can lead soldiers more effectively than leaders who do not possess similar regard for religion, spirituality, or faith.
11. Soldiers with strong religious, spiritual, or faith convictions will perform more effectively in combat than soldiers without regard for religion, spirituality, or faith.

12. The Army, by printing the FM 22-100 non-fiction vignettes, communicated that the heroes' expressed qualities and actions were favorable examples for other Army leaders to emulate.

Study Limitations

1. Resources. The limited availability of Army leadership manuals and documents published before 1951 constrained the research to the period 1951 to 1997.
2. Potential for Bias. The investigator believes that the Army's inclusion of religion, spirituality, and faith in leadership doctrine offers leaders valuable insight into soldier behavior.
3. Assessment Methodology. The investigator used frequency analysis, context analysis, and content assessment to gather research data. Additionally, he discussed changes to Army term-use of religion, spirituality, and faith with authors and editors of FM 22-100. Other investigators can replicate the investigator's research; however, his methodologies do not eliminate all possibility of investigator bias.

Definition of Terms

Army Ethos. "The guiding beliefs, standards and ideals that characterize and motivate the Army."¹

Author's Term-use Message. The thought or idea imparted by a doctrine author by his use of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith in his written discussion of leadership (synonym, Term-use Message).

"Be." One of the investigator's three context analysis classifications. "Be" identifies a leader trait that the Army has determined is desirable for other leaders to adopt or emulate. "Be" is a modified term for the purpose of this paper derived from the U.S. Army's leadership-in-action term "BE."²

Character. “A person’s inner strength, the link between values and behavior.”³

Content Assessment. The investigator’s methodology for answering the content delineating questions and determining whether the author’s message is specified or implied.

Content Delineating Questions. The questions who, what, where, when, why, and how asked by the investigator to determine the details of the author’s message regarding the traits, information, or actions that leaders should “Be” “Know” or “Do” relating to religion, spirituality, and faith. The investigator used the content delineating questions during the content assessment to interpret the context analysis.

Context Analysis. The investigator’s methodology for categorizing each use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith into one of three context classifications: “Be” “Know” or “Do.” The investigator used this methodology to determine whether the author’s message informed leaders that they should “Be” “Know” or “Do” something relating to religion, spirituality, or faith.

Context Analysis Classifications. “Be” “Know” and “Do.”

“Do.” One of the investigator’s three context analysis classifications. “Do” identifies a leader action that the Army has determined is desirable for other leaders to perform. “Do” is a modified term for the purpose of this paper derived from the U.S. Army’s leadership-in-action term “DO.”⁴

Duty. “Behavior required by moral obligation, demanded by custom, or enjoined by feelings of rightness.”⁵

Ethics. “Principals or standards that guide professionals to do the moral or right thing.”⁶

Faith. “Belief and trust in God and in the doctrines expressed in the scriptures or other sacred works; religious conviction.”⁷

Humanism. A philosophy of service for all humanity advocating the methods of reason, science, and democracy and considering all forms of the supernatural as myth.⁸

“Know.” One of the investigator’s three context analysis classifications. “Know” identifies knowledge or information that the Army has determined is desirable for leaders to possess or impart. “Know” is a modified term for the purpose of this paper term derived from the U.S. Army’s leadership-in-action term “KNOW.”⁹

Leadership. “The process of influencing others to accomplish the mission by providing purpose, direction, and motivation.”¹⁰

Leadership Factors. “The four major factors of leadership are always present and affect the actions you should take and when you should take them. They are the led, the leader, the situation, and communications.”¹¹

Leadership Principles. “Fundamental Guidelines for the selection of appropriate actions and orders by a leader.”¹²

Leadership Traits. “Personal qualities which assist in the exercise of military leadership.”¹³

Morals. “Rules, customs [answering the question, what must I do to be right?] Examples: Ten Commandments, West Point honor code, and the Golden Rule.”¹⁴

Pluralism. A condition of society in which numerous distinctive ethnic, religious, or cultural groups coexist within one nation.¹⁵

Proselytize. Convincing others through written or spoken word to accept or adopt certain ideas regarding religion, spirituality, or faith. For the purpose of this research, the investigator does not associate the terms proselytize or proselytizing with any religion or religious group.

Rather, the investigator uses these terms to label the Army's attempts to advance any organizational ideas of religion, spirituality, or faith in leadership doctrine.

Religion. "Any particular integrated system of expressing a belief in and reverence for a superhuman power recognized as the creator and governor of the universe."¹⁶

Secular. Of or pertaining to temporal rather than to the spiritual. Not specifically pertaining to religion or to a religious body.¹⁷

Secularize. To cause or draw away from religious orientation; make worldly; make secular.¹⁸ This study does not associate the term secularize with any specific religion.

Spiritual. Concerned with the soul.¹⁹

Spirituality. "The state, quality, or fact of being spiritual."²⁰

Values. "attitudes about the worth or importance of people, concepts, or things."²¹

¹U.S. Army, FM 100-1, *The Army* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1994), 5.

²U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1990), 53.

³Ibid., 25.

⁴Ibid., 53.

⁵FM 100-1, 1994, 5-6.

⁶John W. Brinsfield, "The Chaplaincy and Moral Leadership," *The Army Chaplaincy PB-1695-3* (Summer 1995): 5.

⁷*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 1978, s.v. "Faith."

⁸Ibid., s.v. "Humanism."

⁹FM 22-100, 1990, 53.

¹⁰Ibid., 1.

¹¹Ibid., 3.

¹² U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1965) 3.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Brinsfield, *The Chaplaincy and Moral Leadership*, 5.

¹⁵ *The American Heritage Dictionary*. s.v. “Pluralism.”

¹⁶ Ibid., s.v. “Religion.”

¹⁷ Ibid., s.v. “Secular.”

¹⁸ Ibid., s.v. “Secularizing.”

¹⁹ Ibid., s.v. “Spiritual.”

²⁰ Ibid., s.v. “Spirituality.”

²¹ FM 22-100, 1990, 23.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Army Doctrine

The Army places great emphasis on writing and disseminating doctrine. Demonstrating a thorough understanding of doctrine is one measure of leader professionalism. The Army expects commanders at all levels to employ their units in accordance with current doctrine; this practice facilitates tactical standardization and provides a measure to gauge proficiency. The following extract from Army FM 100-5 *Operations* describes the purpose of Army doctrine.

Doctrine is the statement of how America's Army, as part of a joint team, intends to conduct war and operations other than war. It is the condensed expression of the Army's fundamental approach to fighting, influencing events in operations other than war and deterring actions detrimental to national interests. . . . Doctrine touches all aspects of the Army. . . . Doctrine should reflect new technology and its potential use for the future, as well as its effects on Army operations. . . . Doctrine seeks to meet the challenges facing the Army by providing the guidance to deal with the range of threats to which elements may be exposed.¹

Familiarity with the changes in Army leadership doctrine, Army leadership philosophies, and Army leadership styles during the period 1951 to 1997 facilitates the understanding of changes in the Army's uses of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith.

Army Leadership Doctrine

Leadership doctrine, a subset of Army doctrine, guides and directs developing leaders. It provides a source of information for instructors and students alike. Leadership doctrine provides the Army with a means to standardize the education and the development of leadership skills, knowledge, and attitudes.² The authors of each of the eight published FM 22-10 and FM 22-100

manuals thought it important to address religion, spirituality, or faith in each of the editions.

Emerging leadership doctrine also addresses religious values.

For almost four decades, religion, spirituality, or faith have been an integral part of the Army's leadership doctrine. However, the frequency with which each author used the terms and his message associated with each term have changed. The Army expects leaders to know and conform to doctrine. Therefore, the inclusion or exclusion of text that addresses religion, spirituality, or faith could influence leaders' styles.

In 1951, FM 22-10 superseded multiple related manuals and served as a single publication for leadership instructors and students alike. Using simple terms, FM 22-10 defined a leader, leadership, leadership principles, leadership techniques, and leadership traits. It expounded on these subjects as well as other aspects of Army leadership, including religion and spirituality. The manual explains that:

The military profession has no monopoly on leadership. In every walk of life, in every industry, in every government, in every phase of human endeavor there are leaders and there are followers. Progress and success are dependent upon the quality and efficacy of leadership.³

According to the leadership doctrine writers of 1951, leadership was the art of influencing and handling men. It was a learnable skill that required understanding, analyzing, predicting, and controlling a subordinate's behavior. Successful leadership required possessing the will to lead together with the character which inspires confidence.⁴

FM 22-10 linked leadership with psychology and identified the authoritarian and persuasive leadership types.

One who is predominantly of the authoritarian type is recognized by the dogmatic use of authority or power. The persuasive type of leadership takes into consideration the human element with all its complexity and with all its differentiation of the physical, mental, and moral capabilities and limitations of the individual. To a great extent, the persuasive leader bases his skill in leadership upon example and ability, with high standards of discipline and

efficiency for himself as well as his followers. This manual is concerned with the development of the persuasive type of leadership.⁵

In 1953, the Army published its first FM 22-100 with two main purposes in mind. First, it was to serve as a guide for junior leaders faced with actual troop leading problems and second, as a text for leadership instruction.⁶ The manual explained,

There is no cookbook recipe for making a leader, and no two leaders ever get results in exactly the same way. But the ability to lead can be learned by breaking the subject down into convenient form for study and practice.⁷

The convenient form mentioned above provided an in-depth explanation of leadership principles, leadership techniques, and military leadership. Like the precursor FM 22-10, FM 22-100 defined leadership, leadership traits, and leadership principles. It also expounded on several other aspects of Army leadership, including solving leadership problems, indications of leadership problems, and special leadership techniques.

In 1958, the Army revised FM 22-100. The revision's purpose was to provide military leaders, actual and prospective, with a practical guide for applying the principles of leadership.⁸ Consistent with contemporary theories of leadership, the Army determined that leadership is not inherent; rather it depended upon developable traits and the application of learnable techniques. Leadership was an art that could be acquired, cultivated, and practiced by any person having the mental and physical ability and the moral integrity expected of a commissioned or a noncommissioned officer.⁹

In 1958, the basic concept of military leadership envisioned a leader cognizant of his responsibilities and strong points and willing to guide himself by the principles of leadership in order to favorably influence and direct his men. This military leader understood his men and the reasons for their behavior.¹⁰ The 1958 FM 22-100 defined a leader, military leadership, leadership traits, leadership principles, and leadership indicators. It expounded on these but also addressed

other aspects of troop leading to include the church as an element of a soldier's environment and the soldier's spiritual welfare and religious activities.

The Army published the 1961 FM 22-100 in order to "provide military leaders, actual and prospective, with a practical guide for applying the principles of leadership."¹¹ Its content regarding the fundamental aspects of leadership remained, for the most part, unchanged from the 1958 FM 22-100. This version, like those preceding it, described military leadership, the leadership principles, and the leadership traits. It also included sections that addressed leadership indicators, leadership problem areas, problem solving, and examples of small unit leadership. It was the first leadership doctrine manual to address personal values, religion, and spiritual needs. The manual encouraged leaders to maintain a religious life and exhibit spiritual values in order to produce stability in their men.

The Army also mentioned nuclear warfare in conjunction with the paragraph addressing religious and spiritual factors producing stability in subordinates. The FM's authors associated the spiritual aspect of leading with coping during a nuclear age.

In 1965, the Army republished FM 22-100 to provide actual and prospective military leaders, particularly those below division level, with a better appreciation and understanding of the art of leadership. The manual was also to serve as a practical guide for effective application of the principles and techniques of leadership.¹²

Consistent with the preceding FM 22-100 and with contemporary leadership theories, the 1961 release stated that leadership is not inherent; rather it is an art, defined as skill in performance acquired by experience, study, or observation. Leadership can be acquired and developed in varying degrees by anyone properly motivated and possessing the necessary mental and physical capabilities.¹³

This manual, like the others in the FM 22-100 series defined military leadership, leadership traits, leadership principles, and leadership indicators, and expounded on each definition. It also contained a lengthy discussion of values, spiritual codes, and importance of religion to both leaders and the led. The manual also mentioned nuclear warfare as in 1961.

One distinction between the 1965 and the 1961 release is the Army's rejection of the persuasive leadership style as the most effective technique and its endorsement of the authoritarian style instead. This change reversed the Army's previously stated view of leadership styles.

In 1973, the Army changed the format of its leadership doctrine manual. The pages of FM 22-100 now included many illustrations. The purpose for this publication was "to provide the military leader with a basic reference for the study of individual and group behavior and the principles and techniques of applied leadership."¹⁴ A major focus now is that leaders should possess a basic understanding of human behavior. This publication would present a wealth of new information in the field of human behavior developed through military and civilian efforts. Its contents represented the latest thinking concerning the relationship between human behavior and good leadership as it applies to the military.¹⁵ Like the preceding FM 22-100 publications, this one included a definition of leadership, leadership traits, and leadership principles. It also contained a chapter that addressed contemporary human problems of drug abuse and race relations.

The purpose of the 1983 version of FM 22-100 was to help leaders operating at the working level: companies, troops, batteries, squadrons, and battalions. Essentially it was a manual for the noncommissioned officers and officers filling leadership positions working closely with subordinates. The authors stated that the manual had three major uses:

1. To help a leader learn what he must be, know, and do.
2. To help a leader to teach, coach, and counsel his subordinates.

3. To help leaders develop cohesive, disciplined, well-trained units that can win under the great stress of battle.¹⁶

As with the previous editions of FM 22-100, the 1983 publication provided the basic definitions of leadership and leadership principles. It also continued the use of illustrations to reinforce learning points and examples. In 1983, the Army introduced the four leadership factors: the leader, the follower, communication, and the situation. Each of these constituted a variable that had an impact on leader actions.

In 1990, the authors of FM 22-100 determined that a new manual should replace its predecessor. This new manual would have two purposes: “to provide an overview of Army leadership doctrine, including the principles for applying leadership theory at all organizational levels to meet operational requirements; and to prescribe the leadership necessary to be effective in peace and war.”¹⁷

The Army’s target audience for this publication was “company grade officers, warrant officers, and noncommissioned officers, the junior leaders of soldiers at the battalion-squadron level and below.” The manual incorporated the “professional military values, the bedrock of our service, that all Army leaders must internalize in the earliest years of their careers.”¹⁸

This manual also addressed seven of the Army’s fundamental expectations for its leaders:

1. Demonstrate tactical and technical competence.
2. Teach subordinates.
3. Be a good listener.
4. Treat soldiers with dignity and respect.
5. Stress basics.
6. Set the example.

7. Set and enforce standards.¹⁹

The 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) has a threefold purpose:

1. To provide a unified theory of leadership for America's Army (both active and reserve) composed of commissioned officers, warrant officers, noncommissioned officers, soldiers, and civilians.
2. To provide doctrine that enables leaders to meet mission requirements during times of peace or during any of the doctrinal types of operations: offensive, defensive, stability, or support.
3. To provide a comprehensive and adaptable manual for the twenty-first century.

This revised manual is for all military and civilian leaders in the Army. The first two parts of the manual apply to all Army leaders and capture those common aspects of leadership. The particular aspects of leadership that differ between uniformed and civilian leaders are noted throughout the manual.

The 1997 revision includes: a description of the leadership process, a description of the Army leader of the twenty first century, a clarification of the skills and actions that differ by level of leadership, and a discussion of leader development responsibilities that will enable the Army to improve to meet future challenges. It states:

This manual supersedes five field manuals and one DA Pamphlet. . . . Ultimately, this revised leadership doctrine will drive future leadership and leader development initiatives associated with the three pillars of the Army's leader development model (DA Pam 350-58, October 1994). Therefore, this manual will serve as:

- The basis for leadership assessment.
- The basis for leadership counseling and development.
- The basis for leadership evaluation, to include the Officer Evaluation Report (OER).
- A point of departure for development and implementation of leadership tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs).
- A guide for TRADOC schools during institutional instruction.
- A springboard for an individual leader's self-development initiatives.²⁰

Historical Examples of Religion, Spirituality, or Faith as Elements of Leadership

Traditionally, many Army leaders have considered religion, spirituality, and faith as important elements of leadership. These influences have shaped doctrine and offered insight into the purposes for religion, spirituality, and faith to be addressed in leadership doctrine.

George Washington made clear his views regarding religion, faith, and soldiering. His orders indicate that he considered the spiritual health of his Army directly related to its combat performance. As the nation's first commander in chief, he directed his Army chaplains to openly endorse the Bible, and Christian values in particular, as a means of developing soldiers. Washington believed the indoctrination of soldiers with Biblical scripture was a significant aspect of soldier development, and he looked to his officer corps to assist the chaplains in spreading God's Word.²¹

Article One of the U.S. Rules and Articles of War until 1863 encouraged all soldiers and officers to attend church:

It is earnestly recommended to all officers and soldiers diligently to attend divine service; and all officers who shall behave indecently or irreverently at any place of divine worship shall, if commissioned officers, be brought before a general court-martial.²²

Robert E. Lee, like George Washington, was a devout Christian military leader who emphasized the importance of God and prayer. Following the battle of Fredericksburg he penned:

The General commanding takes this occasion to express to the officers and soldiers of the army his high appreciation of the fortitude, valor, and devotion displayed by them, which, under the blessing of Almighty God, have added the victory of Fredericksburg to their long list of triumphs. . . .

That this great result was achieved with a loss small in point of numbers only augments the admiration with which the Commanding General regards the powers of the troops and increases his gratitude to Him who hath given us victory. . . .

The signal manifestations of Divine mercy that have distinguished the eventful and glorious campaign of the year just closing, give assurance of hope, that, under the guidance of the same Almighty hand, the coming year will be no less fruitful of events, etc.²³

During the Second World War, America's National Research Council produced a pocket-sized manual for distribution to American servicemen. The publication *Psychology for the Fighting Man* documents that faith, manifested as prayer, bolsters the courage of soldiers facing combat:

Nor may we forget the power of religious belief as an antidote to fear. When men get into a tight spot they pray. They pray hard and from the heart, and they feel the better for it. Prayer works.²⁴

A more current example of an Army leader who believed religious values are an important aspect of leading soldiers is General John Wickham Jr. General Wickham, speaking to the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College said:

It's been said that those who carry the lives of others in their hands must carry the grace of God in their hearts.²⁵

Corporate Concepts Regarding Religion, Spirituality, and Faith as Elements of Leadership

The military is not unique in associating religion, spirituality, or faith with leadership. Many corporate leaders and consultants consider spirituality and faith to be aspects of leading that are worthy of mention. Peter M. Senge, a corporate consultant and author of *The Fifth Discipline*, indicates that Kazuo Inamori, founder and president of Kyocera (a world leader in advanced ceramics technology) believes his duty as a manager starts with 'providing for both the material and spiritual welfare of my employees.'²⁶

Stephen R. Covey, author of the international best-selling book *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* writes that a person's spiritual dimension provides leadership to their life:

The spiritual dimension is your core, your center, your commitment to your value system. It's a very private area of your life and a supremely important one. It draws upon the sources that inspire and uplift you and tie you to the timeless truths of all humanity.²⁷

Michael T. Matteson and John M. Ivancevich, the authors of *Managing Job Stress and Health*, write the following about the value of prayer to the business or corporate leader:

Praying, for some people, represents the most effective stress reducer in their lives. They experience a sense of calmness and inner peace after prayer which they do not find in any other way. In our own research we have been surprised at the number of people who report that prayer is their chief coping mechanism against stress.²⁸

¹U.S. Army, FM 100-5, *Operations* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1993), 1-1, 1-2.

²FM 22-100, 1990, i.

³U.S. Army, FM 22-10, *Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1951) 2.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., 3.

⁶U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Command and Leadership for the Small Unit Leader* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1953) 1.

⁷Ibid.

⁸U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1958) 3.

⁹Ibid., 4.

¹⁰Ibid., 5.

¹¹U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1961) 2.

¹²FM 22-100, 1965, 2.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1973) i.

¹⁵Ibid., v-vi.

¹⁶U.S. Army, FM 22-100, *Military Leadership* (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1983) 1.

¹⁷FM 22-100, 1990, i.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰U.S. Army, Center for Army Leadership, FM 22-100, "Military Leadership," Initial Draft, Unedited. (Ft. Leavenworth, KS, Center for Army Leadership, 1997). iv-v.

²¹Brinsfield, *The Chaplaincy and Moral Leadership*, 15.

²²U.S. Army, *Revised United States Army Regulations of 1861* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1863) 485.

²³William J. Johnstone, *Robert E. Lee, The Christian* (Chicago: Abington Press, 1933) 100.

²⁴National Research Council, *Psychology for the Fighting Man* (Washington: Infantry Journal: Penguin Books, 1944.) 252.

²⁵John Wickham, Jr. (GEN) Speech presented to The Army Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, June 1983.

²⁶Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of Learning Organization* (New York: Doubleday, 1990), 140.

²⁷Stephen R. Covey, *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1989), 292.

²⁸Michael T. Matteson and John M. Ivancevich, *Managing Job Stress and Health: The Intelligent Person's Guide* (New York: The Free Press, 1982) 256.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Techniques

To identify and document the Army's term use changes, the investigator reviewed each manual starting with the 1951 FM 22-10 and progressed through each subsequent FM 22-100 to include the currently proposed 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft). He then used three techniques to gather the data and answer the research questions: frequency analysis, context analysis, and content assessment.

The frequency analysis recorded and enumerated every use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in each manual. The context analysis categorized each term use in one of three context classification, "Be" "Know" and "Do." The content assessment first answered the content delineating questions to identify the details of the author's message, and then it determined whether the author's message was specific or implicit.

Step 1. Frequency Analysis

Descriptive methodologies do not produce irrefutable evidence, an inherent weakness of this research technique. In order to increase objectivity, the investigator totaled each manual's use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as a standard of measure. Quantification alone however, did not provide sufficient data to interpret the author's term-use message. Two different authors might both use the term religion yet impart contradicting messages regarding the importance of religion as an element of leadership. Allowing for such term-use variances, the

investigator developed the context analysis and content assessment to establish the meaning of the Army's term-use changes.

Step 2. Context Analysis

The investigator's context analysis provides a second method of translating different term-uses into standard measures for comparing the terms religion, spirituality, and faith. To establish this standard measure, the investigator utilized three mutually exclusive context classifications "Be" "Know" and "Do." The investigator borrowed these category titles from the Army's leadership-in-action terms BE, KNOW, and DO.¹ He also tailored the terms' definitions to accomplish the purpose of this study. "Be" is the classification category that encompasses desirable personal traits or qualities that leaders may exhibit. For example, a soldier may "Be" religious. "Know" is desirable knowledge a leader might possess. "Do" is a desirable action a leader might take. The Army determines "desirability" by discussing a characteristic in Army leadership doctrine. Figure 1 illustrates the context classifications.

Figure 1. Context Classifications.

Term Use Classifications		
Be	Know	Do

Content Assessment

After the investigator classified the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as either "Be" "Know" or "Do" he completed the content assessment. The content assessment determined the author's term-use message by answering the content delineating questions who, what, where, when, why, and how as each relates to the context classifications "Be" "Know" and "Do." The content

assessment also determined whether the author's message was specific or implicit. Admittedly, the investigator's content assessment was subjective; however, it did provide a template for making term-use comparisons. Table 1 illustrates a content assessment matrix.

Table 1. Content Assessment Matrix.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified						
Implied						

The Research Questions

The investigator perceived an apparent decreased emphasis on religion and spirituality in the 1990 edition of FM 22-100 as compared to the 1983 FM 22-100. His follow-on questions regarding both the Army's future and past use of religion, spirituality, and faith in its leadership doctrine formed the bases for the research questions.

Primary Research Question

How has U.S. Army leadership doctrine changed in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith since 1951?

Subordinate Research Questions

1. What is the frequency of use of the terms "religion," "spirituality," and "faith" in the Army's FM 22-100 series publications between 1951 and 1997?
2. What is the Army's context and content for each use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the FM 22-100 series between 1951 and 1997?

¹FM 22-100, 1990, 53.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Frequency Analysis

In this chapter the investigator documents his term-use count, context analysis, and content assessment. The term-use count totals appear twice, first in summary tables and figures following this introduction and then again in this chapter as part of the detailed review of each FM. Likewise, the data gathered during the context analysis and the content assessments appear twice, first using summary tables and figures and later in this chapter's detailed narrative.

The summary tables and figures facilitate quick comparison of the cumulative data. They also ease the identification of trends in message context and content throughout the FM 22-100 series history. The detailed review of each FM provides both narrative text and tables to present the investigator's data relating to each individual use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith.

Table 2. Term-use Frequency for Religion, Spirituality, and Faith by FM Publication Year.

	Religion	Spirituality	Faith	Total
FM 22-10, 1951	1	1	0	2
FM 22-100, 1953	1	0	0	1
FM 22-100, 1958	1	1	0	2
FM 22-100, 1961	3	6	0	9
FM 22-100, 1965	3	6	0	9
FM 22-100, 1973	7	1	0	8
FM 22-100, 1983	8	5	1	14
FM 22-100, 1990	3	0	1	4
FM 22-100, 1997 (Draft)	4	0	0	4
Total	31	20	2	53

Table 2 lists the term-use frequency for religion, spirituality, and faith. Figure 2 graphs the term-use frequency by publication year.




Figure 2. Term-use Frequency for Religion, Spirituality, and Faith by FM Publication Year

Context Analysis and Content Assessment

The following tables and figures provide the data compiled during the investigator's context analysis and content assessment of the FM 22-100 series manuals. The investigator first categorized the terms religion, spirituality, and faith into one of the three context analysis classifications "Be" "Know" and "Do." The context analysis determined whether the authors used the terms religion, spirituality, or faith to impart or communicate that leaders should "Be" "Know" or "Do" something relating to religion, spirituality, or faith. After completing the context analysis, the investigator completed the content assessment. The purpose of the content assessment was to cull information that might inform leaders of the who, what, where, when, why, and how of "Be"ing, "Know"ing, and "Do"ing something related to religion, spirituality, or faith.

Context Analysis

Table 3 lists the investigator's context classification of each term: religion, spirituality, or faith. Once classified as either "Be" "Know" or "Do" the investigator totaled each occurrence in order to identify possible trends in message context. Figure 3 graphically illustrates the data listed in Table 3.

Table 3. Context Classification of the Terms Religion, Spirituality, and Faith as "Be" "Know" and "Do" by FM Publication Year.

	Be	Know	Do	Total
FM 22-10, 1951	0	0	2	2
FM 22-100, 1953	0	0	1	1
FM 22-100, 1958	0	0	2	2
FM 22-100, 1961	2	5	2	9
FM 22-100, 1965	2	5	2	9
FM 22-100, 1973	0	6	2	8
FM 22-100, 1983	0	13	1	14
FM 22-100, 1990	0	4	0	4
FM 22-100, 1997(Draft)	0	4	0	4
Total	4	37	12	53




Figure 3. Context Classification of the Terms Religion, Spirituality, and Faith As "Be" "Know" and "Do" by FM Publication Year

Content Assessment

The investigator completed the content assessments by first answering the content delineating questions who, what, where, when, why, and how. His purpose was to identify detailed guidance that the authors may have included regarding "Be"ing, "Know"ing, or "Do"ing as each might relate to religion, spirituality, or faith. He then determined whether the author specifically or implicitly answered the delineating questions. The investigator totaled the number of content delineating questions answered to identify possible content or message trends regarding the terms religion, spirituality, and faith. Table 4 provides the totals; figure 4 graphically illustrates them.

Table 4. Frequency of Answered Questions (Specified/Implied).

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
FM 22-10, 1951	2	2			2	
FM 22-100, 1953	1	1			1	
FM 22-100, 1958	2	2			2	
FM 22-100, 1961	7/2	8/1	1		4	
FM 22-100, 1965	7/2	8/1	1		4	
FM 22-100, 1973	5	7	3		2	1
FM 22-100, 1983	11/1	12/1		2	1	1/1
FM 22-100, 1990	3/1	3/1				/1
FM 22-100, 1997 (Draft)	3/1	4	0	1	1	
Total	41/7	47/4	5	3	17	2/2




Figure 4, Total Frequency of Answered Content Delineating Questions.

Table 5 lists the total number of times the terms religion, spirituality, or are used to expressly inform a leader what he should “Be” “Know” or “Do” relating to religion, spirituality, or faith.

Table 5. Authors’ Frequency of Directing Leaders to “Be” “Know” or “Do” Relating to Religion, Spirituality, or Faith.

	“Be”	“Know”	“Do”	% of Total: “Be” “Know” and “Do”
FM 22-10, 1951	0	0	2	100%
FM 22-100, 1953	0	0	1	100%
FM 22-100, 1958	0	0	2	100%
FM 22-100, 1961	2	2	2	67%
FM 22-100, 1965	2	2	2	67%
FM 22-100, 1973	0	0	2	25%
FM 22-100, 1983	0	1	1	14%
FM 22-100, 1990	0	2	0	50%
FM 22-100, 1997 (Draft)	0	3	0	75%

The investigator’s content assessment revealed that the authors’ use of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith did not always communicate a message exclusively about a leader’s personal traits or skills. The authors frequently used the terms to articulate how religion, spirituality, or faith are important to subordinates. The investigator calculated the percentage of terms used to express the traits, ideas, or acts that leaders should personally “Be” “Know” or “Do.” The investigator compiled this data to determine whether the text addressing religion, spirituality, or faith might suggest that Army leadership doctrine proselytized for the purpose of creating either a core of religious Army leaders or an army of spiritual soldiers.

Context Analysis and Content Assessment Narrative

1951

FM 22-10 gave little attention to religion or spirituality and did not mention faith. The one-time use of the terms spiritual and religion outlined a technique for monitoring their subordinate's welfare. FM 22-10 indicated that leaders should: "Provide for the *spiritual* welfare of your command by supporting *religious* activities (emphasis added)." ¹ The manual lists this as an application of Leadership Principle III, "Know Your Men And Look Out For Their Welfare."² The Army's explanation of Leadership Principle III follows:

By making a conscientious effort to observe the members of his command as often as possible, to become personally acquainted with them, to recognize their individual differences, and to share in their joys and sorrows, the leader will have a better understanding of how his subordinates react and function under various conditions. He then will be able to employ them more effectively. By assuring himself that the members of his command are as comfortable, well cared for, and contented as circumstances will permit, the leader wins their confidence, respect, and cooperation. By neglecting their welfare, the leader indicates indifference and, as a consequence, forfeits the trust and confidence of his men.³

1951, "Be"

This author's use of the terms spiritual and religious did not inform leaders that they should "Be" religious or spiritual; therefore, the investigator did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification "Be."

1951, "Know"

The investigator did not consider "Know" the best classification for these two terms; therefore, he did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification "Know."

1951, “Do”

The authors of FM 22-10 informed leaders that they should “Do” or take two actions relating to religion or spirituality: provide for the *spiritual* welfare of your command and support *religious* activities (emphasis added).⁴ The investigator’s content assessment determined that the author’s narrative did not specifically mention leaders, but it clearly intended to inform leaders (Who) to provide for their subordinates’ spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What). Such actions by leaders were a demonstration of Leadership Principle III (Why). The authors omitted instructions that explain where, when, or how leaders should perform the two actions. Tables 6 and 7 illustrate the content assessment matrices.

Table 6. 1951, “Do” Provide for Spiritual Welfare.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 7. 1951, “Do” Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1953

In 1953, the authors addressed one action, “Support *Religious* Activities (emphasis added),” an element of Leadership Principle VI: “Know your men and look out for their welfare.”⁵ The manual did not use the terms spiritual or faith.

1953, “Be”

This edition’s singular reference to religion did not instruct leaders to “Be” religious; rather, it informed leaders to facilitate their subordinates’ religious activities. The investigator did not conduct a content assessment matrix for the classification “Be.”

1953, “Know”

The investigator did not classify this singular term-use as “Know” and therefore, did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification “Know.”

1953, “Do”

The authors of FM 22-100 informed readers that they should “Do” one act in accordance with Leadership Principle VI. The investigator’s content assessment determined that the author’s narrative did not specifically mention leaders, but it clearly intended to inform leaders (Who) to provide for their subordinates’ spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What). Such actions by leaders were a demonstration of Leadership Principle III (Why). The authors of the 1953 edition, like the authors of the 1951 FM 22-10, omitted instructions regarding the details of location, timing, reason, or methodology. Table 8 illustrates the content assessment matrix for the classification “Do.”

Table 8. 1953, “Do” Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1958

The 1958 edition of FM 22-100, like the 1951 edition, included two uses of the terms religion and spirituality: “Provide For the *Spiritual* Welfare of Your Command by Supporting *Religious* Activities (emphasis added).”⁶ These are two methods for demonstrating Leadership Principle III: “Know your men and look out for their welfare.”⁷ It did not mention faith.

1958, “Be”

The author’s instructions did not direct leaders to “Be” religious or spiritual. Rather, they instructed leaders to “Do” two actions. For this reason, the investigator did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification “Be.”

1958, “Know”

The investigator did not select “Know” as the best classification for the terms spiritual and religion; therefore, he did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification “Know.”

1958, “Do”

The authors informed readers that they should “Do” two actions in accordance with Leadership Principle III. The investigator’s content assessment determined that the author’s narrative did not specifically mention leaders, but it clearly intended to inform leaders (Who) to

provide for their subordinates' spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What). Such actions by leaders were a demonstration of Leadership Principle III (Why). The author omitted the details regarding where, when, and how. Tables 9 and 10 illustrate the content assessment matrices.

Table 9. 1958, "Do" Provide for Spiritual Welfare.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 10. 1958, "Do" Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1961

In 1961, FM 22-100 printed the terms religion and spirituality nine times. The authors did not use the term faith. The terms religion and spirituality appeared in one paragraph six times. This paragraph was the first in any FM 22-100 to endorse a religious life for leaders:

A person who has matured in our society usually has acquired certain *spiritual* and moral values. These values not only strengthen an individual's character, but also provide him with a source of inner strength and stability during times of crises. Man's need to live up to the accepted *spiritual* and moral code of his society will help him to overcome fear. This will assist in providing courage to face difficult issues in his daily life or to fight effectively in combat. . . . The effective leader recognizes the inherent strength that can be derived from

spiritual sources and appreciates the importance of the individual's *spiritual* needs. He provides opportunities for worship whenever possible. Above all, the leader must realize his own character has an important influence on his subordinates. If he demonstrates high moral principles and integrity, these qualities will influence his subordinates. His *religious* life, from this standpoint, becomes vitally important as a factor in producing stable qualities in his men. It serves as a bulwark in his own life when confronted with difficult challenges. The leader who thoroughly understands and exhibits moral and *spiritual* values will be better prepared to lead his men in this nuclear era in which men will have to face the danger of tremendous destructive forces (emphases added).⁸

The authors imbedded the seventh term-use of religion in a pictorial diagram with an associated narrative paragraph. The diagram's narrative explained the supports but did not list each of them. The term religion appears in the diagram's text. The picture's narrative follows:

The internal and external stresses tend to cause a man to function ineffectively while the supports [religion] help him to function effectively. In varying circumstances, the emphasis on particular stresses or supports will change and factors not even shown may become important. The stresses and support are interrelated and interdependent; e.g., success fosters esprit de corps and esprit de corps helps to ensure success; supports may become stresses if they are inadequate. . . . It is incumbent upon the leader to be aware of conditions so he can endeavor to strengthen the supports and relieve the stresses, and thereby help him to function effectively.⁹

The final two terms, religion and spirituality, appeared in Leadership Principle III, "Provide for the *spiritual* welfare of your command by supporting *religious* activities (emphasis added)."¹⁰

1961, "Be"

Two of the nine references to religion or spirituality informed the reader that a leader's should "Be" religious and spiritual:

1. Above all, the leader must realize his own character has an important influence on his subordinates. If he demonstrates high moral principles and integrity, these qualities will influence his subordinates. His (Who) *religious* life (What), from this standpoint, becomes vitally important as a factor in producing stable qualities in his men (Why).

2. The leader (Who) who thoroughly understands and exhibits (What) moral and *spiritual* values will be better prepared to lead his men in this nuclear era in which men will have to face the danger of tremendous destructive forces (Why). Tables 11 and 12 illustrate the content assessment matrices.

Table 11. 1961, "Be" His Religious Life Becomes Vitally Important in Producing Stable Qualities in His Men.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 12. 1961, "Be" The Leader Who Understands and Exhibits Moral and Spiritual Values Will be Better Prepared to Lead his Men.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

The diagram in the 1961 FM 22-100 is not relevant to a discussion of "Be" as an appropriate context classification. It simply lists religion among several behavioral supports.

Leadership Principle III does not encourage leaders to "Be" spiritual; rather, it directs them to provide for their subordinates' spiritual welfare.

1961, “Know”

The authors of FM 22-100, 1961 use the terms religion or spirituality five times. The investigator classified these as “Know.”

1. A person who (Who) has matured in our society (Where) usually has acquired certain *spiritual* and moral values. These values not only strengthen an individual's character, but also provide him with a source of inner strength and stability during times of crises (What).
2. Man's (Who) need to live up to the accepted *spiritual* code will help him overcome fear (What). This will assist in providing courage to face difficult issues in his daily life or to fight effectively in combat.
3. The effective leader (Who) recognizes the inherent strength (What) from *spiritual* sources.
4. An effective leader (Who) appreciates the importance (What) of individual's *spiritual* needs.
5. A leader must be aware of conditions so that he can strengthen the supports to help the soldier (Who) function effectively (What).

Tables 13 through 17 illustrate the content assessment.

Table 13. 1961, “Know” A Person Who has Matured in Our Society Usually Has Certain Spiritual Values.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X	X			
Implied						

Table 14. 1961, "Know" Man's Need to Live Up to the Accepted Spiritual Code Will Help Him Overcome Fear.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 15. 1961, "Know" The Effective Leader Recognizes the Inherent Strength from Spiritual Sources and He Appreciates the Importance of Individual Spiritual Needs.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 16. 1961, "Know" An Effective Leader Appreciates the Importance of Individual Spiritual Needs.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied	X					

Table 17. 1961, "Know" Strengthen Supports (religion) to help the Soldier Function.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified						
Implied	X	X				

1961, “Do”

Leadership Principle III provides readers two term-use examples the investigator classified as “Do.” The content assessment reveals that the authors were specific about leaders (Who) providing for their subordinates’ spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What) and the reason (Why) for supporting religious activities. The authors omitted the details regarding location (Where), timing (When), and methodology (How). Tables 18 and 19 illustrate the content assessment for the classification “Do.”

Table 18. 1961, “Do” Provide for Spiritual Welfare.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 19. 1961, “Do” Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1965

In 1965, FM 22-100 printed the terms religion and spirituality nine times. The first six appear in one paragraph. This paragraph endorsed a religious life for leaders and stated that possessing spiritual values made individuals better leaders:

A person who has matured in our society usually has acquired certain *spiritual* and moral values. These values not only strengthen an individual's character, but also provide him with a source of inner strength and stability during times of crises. Man's need to live up to the accepted *spiritual* and moral code of his society will help him to overcome fear. This will assist in providing courage to face difficult issues in his daily life or to fight effectively in combat. . . . The effective leader recognizes the inherent strength that can be derived from *spiritual* sources and appreciates the importance of the individual's *spiritual* needs. He provides opportunities for worship whenever possible. Above all, the leader must realize his own character has an important influence on his subordinates. If he demonstrates high moral principles and integrity, these qualities will influence his subordinates. His *religious* life, from this standpoint, becomes vitally important as a factor in producing stable qualities in his men. It serves as a bulwark in his own life when confronted with difficult challenges. The leader who thoroughly understands and exhibits moral and *spiritual* values will be better prepared to lead his men in this nuclear era in which men will have to face the danger of tremendous destructive forces (emphasis added).¹¹

The authors imbedded the seventh term-use (religion) in a pictorial diagram with an associated narrative paragraph. The narrative's text explained the supports but did not list each of them. The diagram's text identifies religion as one of the supports:

The internal and external stresses tend to cause a man to function ineffectively while the supports [*religion*] help him to function effectively. In varying circumstances, the emphasis on particular stresses or supports will change and factors not even shown may become important. The stresses and support are interrelated and interdependent; e.g., success fosters esprit de corps and esprit de corps helps to ensure success; supports may become stresses if they are inadequate. . . . It is incumbent upon the leader to be aware of conditions so he can endeavor to strengthen the supports and relieve the stresses, and thereby help him to function effectively.¹²

The final two terms are religion and spirituality. These two appeared in Leadership Principle III, "Provide for the *spiritual* welfare of your command by supporting *religious* activities (emphasis added)."¹³

1965, "Be"

Two of the nine references to religion or spirituality informed the reader that a leader's should "Be" religious and spiritual:

1. Above all, the leader must realize his own character has an important influence on his subordinates. If he demonstrates high moral principles and integrity, these qualities will influence his subordinates. His (Who) *religious* life (What), from this standpoint, becomes vitally important as a factor in producing stable qualities in his men (Why).

2. The leader (Who) who thoroughly understands and exhibits (What) moral and *spiritual* values will be better prepared to lead his men in this nuclear era in which men will have to face the danger of tremendous destructive forces (Why). Table 20 and 21 illustrate.

Table 20. 1965, "Be" His Religious Life Becomes Vitally Important in Producing Stability Qualities in His Men.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 21. 1965, "Be" The Leader Who Understands and Exhibits Moral and Spiritual Values Will Be Better Prepared to Lead His Men.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

The diagram does not direct readers to "Be" religious; therefore, it is not relevant to a discussion of "Be." The investigator did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification "Be."

Leadership Principle III does not encourage leaders to "Be" spiritual; rather, it directs them to provide for their subordinates' spiritual welfare. The investigator did not conduct a content assessment for Leadership Principle III in terms of "Be."

1965, "Know"

The authors of FM 22-100, 1965 use the terms religion or spirituality five times. The investigator classified these as "Know":

1. A person who (Who) has matured in our society (Where) usually has acquired certain *spiritual* and moral values. These values not only strengthen an individual's character, but also provide him with a source of inner strength and stability during times of crises (What).
2. Man's (Who) need to live up to the accepted *spiritual* code will help him overcome fear (What). This will assist in providing courage to face difficult issues in his daily life or to fight effectively in combat.
3. The effective leader (Who) recognizes the inherent strength (What) from *spiritual* sources.
4. The effective leader (Who) appreciates the importance (What) of individual's *spiritual* needs.
5. A leader must be aware of conditions so that he can strengthen the supports to help the soldier (Who) function effectively (What). Tables 22 through 26 illustrate the content assessments.

Table 22. 1965, "Know" A Person Who Has Matured in Our Society Usually has Certain Spiritual Values.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X	X			
Implied						

Table 23. 1965, "Know" Man's Need to Live Up to the Accepted Spiritual Code Will Help Him Overcome Fear.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 24. 1965, "Know" The Effective Leader Recognizes the Inherent Strength from Spiritual Sources.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 25. 1965, "Know" The Effective Leader Appreciates the Importance of Individual Spiritual Needs.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied	X					

Table 26. 1965, "Know," Strengthen Supports (religion) to help the Soldier Function.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified						
Implied	X	X				

1965, "Do"

Leadership Principle III provides readers with two term-use examples that the investigator classified as "Do." The content assessment reveals that the authors were specific about leaders (Who) providing for their subordinates' spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What) and the reason (Why) for supporting religious activities. The authors omitted the details regarding location (Where), timing (When), and methodology (How). Tables 27 and 28 illustrate the content assessment matrices for the classification "Do."

Table 27. 1965 "Do" Provide for Spiritual Welfare.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 28. 1965, "Do" Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1973

The authors of the 1973 FM 22-100 used the terms religion and spirituality eight times.

They did not use the term faith. The first two terms appear in the leadership principle technique, "Provide for the *spiritual* welfare of your command by supporting *religious* activities (emphasis added)." Which the Army has printed repeatedly in the FM 22-100 publication series as a method of exhibiting the leadership principle, "Know Your Men and Look out for Their Welfare."¹⁴

The authors printed the third term in a paragraph that associates religion with ethical standards. "Within the society of the United States, the people have determined their ethical code through government, their *religion*, and the culture and traditions of the country (emphasis added)."¹⁵

The fourth term addresses soldier attitudes and explains that, "our attitude toward others may be influenced by the doctrine of brotherly love (*religious* values) (emphasis added)."¹⁶

The last four references are part of a paragraph that explains religious values,

Religious values. These values are characterized by reverence for life, human dignity, and freedom to worship. *Religious* values are indicated by the expressed belief in a supreme being or another force which is beyond the comprehension of man. The roots of *religious* values are found in oral or written *religious* doctrine. For centuries, the Judeo-Christian heritage has been the foundation of most American's *religious* beliefs and practices (emphasis added).¹⁷

1973, "Be"

None of the eight terms are relevant to "Be." For this reason, the investigator did not conduct a content assessment matrix for the classification "Be."

1973, "Know"

Six of the terms are relevant to "Know":

1. Within the society of the United States (Where), the people (Who) have determined their ethical code (What) through their *religion* (How)." The investigator's content assessment indicates the author is specific about who, what, and where, and how but did not address when or why. Table 29 illustrates.

Table 29. 1973, "Know" Religion and Traditions Have Influenced Ethical Code.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X	X			X
Implied						

2. Our (Who) attitude toward others (What) may be influenced by the doctrine of brotherly love (*religious* values). The content assessment indicates that the authors are specific regarding who and what. They did not address the location, timing, reason, and methodology.

Table 30 illustrates.

Table 30. 1973, “Know” Our Attitude Toward Others may be Influenced by the Doctrine of Brotherly Love.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

The last four term-uses inform leaders that they should “Know” that an awareness of religious values, can assist leaders lead more effectively. The author did not include details regarding location, timing, reason, or methodology.

1. *Religious* values are indicated by the expressed belief in a supreme being or another force which is beyond the comprehension of man (What).
2. The roots (What) of *religious* values.
3. Are found in oral or written *religious* doctrine (Where).
4. For centuries, (When) the Judeo-Christian heritage has been the foundation (What) of most American’s (Who) *religious* beliefs and practices.

Tables 31 through 34 illustrate the content assessment matrices.

Table 31. 1973, “Know” *Religious* Values are Indicated by the Expressed Belief in a Supreme Being or Another Force which is Beyond the Comprehension of Man.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied						

Table 32. 1973, "Know" The Roots of *Religious* Values.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied						

Table 33. 1973, "Know" Are Found in Oral or Written *Religious* Doctrine.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified			X			
Implied						

Table 34. 1973, "Know" For centuries, the Judeo-Christian Heritage has been the Foundation of Most American's *Religious* Beliefs and Practices.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X	X			
Implied						

1973, "Do"

Leadership Principle III uses both terms spiritual and religion. The content assessment revealed that the authors were specific about leaders (Who) providing for their subordinates' spiritual welfare by supporting religious activities (What) and the reason (Why) for supporting religious activities. The authors did not address the details regarding location, timing, or methodology. Tables 35 and 36 illustrate the content assessments.

Table 35. 1973, "Do" Provide for Spiritual Welfare.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 36. 1973, "Do" Support Religious Activities.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1983

In 1983, FM 22-100 used the terms religion, spirituality, or faith thirteen times. The authors implied that a religious leader can effectively motivate religious soldiers. The first five terms appear in a vignette that outlined the military life of Sergeant Alvin C. York and emphasized how his values reflected his Biblical beliefs. Essentially, Sergeant York (then Private York), a reformed "hellraiser" and Biblical Christian who, because of his *religious* beliefs applied for conscientious objector status. His company commander saw tremendous potential in York and attempted in many counseling sessions to convince York that killing in war is not against God's Word. The company commander, who would have made York a sergeant except for York's *religious* reservations about killing, consulted the battalion commander, a *religious* man who knew the Bible as well. After much discussion about the morality of killing in war, the battalion commander granted Sergeant York two weeks leave at home. Ultimately, York decided killing

enemy soldiers would not violate the precepts of his *faith*. He returned to his unit willing to deploy overseas where he earned the Congressional Medal of Honor for his actions against an enemy.¹⁸

The sixth reference also appears in a vignette. The authors detailed the American Civil War battle at Little Round Top vicinity Gettysburg. During the battle, Colonel Joshua Chamberlain led the 20th Maine to a significant victory over more numerous Confederate forces. His superiors credited Colonel Chamberlain for the Union victory:

Chamberlain's *religious* training had a strong impact on the good part of his character. He studied for three years in seminary to be a minister. He held the Judeo-Christian values of selflessness, respect, kindness and compassion for others (emphasis added).¹⁹

The remaining eight references to religion or spirituality appear in several paragraphs that address the uniquely human higher-level needs of spirit and soul:

One of the things that make humans unique is the higher-level needs of the *spirit* or soul. Leaders must encourage subordinates to realize the importance of these needs. Some of these needs are:

- The need for religion [heading, not counted]. From the beginning of recorded history, most people have shown a strong need to believe in God or some form of higher *religious* being. People need to explain everything that happens. Science cannot explain everything, and that leaves a mysterious void that people cannot tolerate. Most people need to believe that God exists in some form of higher *spiritual* being and that this *spiritual* being has a plan for the universe and an explanation for the many events that cannot be explained by reason and science.

- Many people not normally *religious* become so in time of war. The danger and chaos of war give rise to the human need to believe that a greater *spiritual* being is guiding one's fate for the best, regardless of whether one lives or dies. In this sense it helps soldiers to believe that they are fighting for a cause that is moral and right in the eyes of their *religion*. This is an important source of motivation for soldiers all over the world. Remember York's dilemma. He could not rest until he believed that God wanted him to fight.

- Leaders, as well as chaplains, can assist soldiers by bolstering their *spiritual* strength and their conviction that they are doing the moral thing.

- . . . It is true that the lower-level needs are important motivators in battle. But the evidence shows that when the higher-level needs are activated in soldiers, they are a more powerful, lasting force. Before soldiers can be motivated by higher-level needs, however, several important conditions must be met. The leaders must have excellent character, knowledge, and skills; they must believe in and selflessly serve the higher cause (emphasis added).²⁰

1983, "Be"

The fourteen terms do not direct leaders to "Be" religious, spiritual, or faithful to a deity. For this reason the investigator did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification "Be."

1983, "Know"

The story that outlined Sergeant York's faith and war experience specified that today's leaders should "Know" that:

1. Sergeant York's (Who) *religious* beliefs lead him to apply as a conscientious objector (What).
2. Sergeant York's (Who) *religious* convictions gave him reservations about killing (What).
3. Major Buxton (Who) was a deeply *religious* man who knew the Bible (What).
4. Sergeant York (Who) decided he could fight and not violate (What) the precepts of his *faith*. Tables 37 through 40 show the content assessments.

Table 37. 1983, "Know" Sergeant York's Religious Beliefs led him to Apply as a Conscientious Objector.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 38. 1983 “Know” Sergeant York’s Religious Convictions gave him Reservations about Killing.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 39. 1983, “Know” Major Buxton was a Deeply Religious Man who Knew the Bible.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 40. 1983, “Know” Sergeant York Determined he Could Fight and not Violate the Precepts of His Faith.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

The authors also specified that leaders should “Know” Chamberlain’s (Who) religious training had a strong impact on his character (What). Table 41 illustrates the content assessment.

Table 41. 1983, “Know” Chamberlain’s Religious Training had a Strong Impact on the Good Part of His Character.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

The authors imply that leaders who “Know” about religion, are better able to lead soldiers who are religious. The examples of the Company Commander and the Battalion Commander demonstrate that those two leaders (Who) knew the nature and strength of York’s convictions (What) and how to lead Sergeant York (How). Table 42 depicts the content assessment.

Table 42. 1983, (Implied) “Know” That Knowledge of Religion can Enhance a Leader’s Ability to Lead Religious Soldiers.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified						
Implied		X	X			X

Several paragraphs address religion and spirituality and their term-uses are relevant to “Know.” The six term-uses follow:

1. One of the things that make humans (Who) unique is the higher-level needs (What) of the *spirit* or soul.
2. From the beginning of recorded history (When), most people (Who) have shown a strong need to believe in God (What) or some form of higher *religious* being.

3. Most people (Who) need to believe that God exists (What) in some form of higher *spiritual* being.

4. This *spiritual* being (Who) has a plan for the universe (What).

5. Many people (Who) not normally *religious* become so in time of war (What).

6. The danger and chaos of war give rise to the human need to believe that a greater *spiritual* being is guiding one's (Who) fate for the best, regardless of whether one live or dies (What).

Tables 43 through 49 reflect the content assessments.

Table 43. 1983, "Know" Humans Have Higher-level Needs of Spirit and Soul.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 44. 1983, "Know" From The Beginning of Recorded History Most People have Shown a Need to Believe in God or Some Higher Religious Being.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X		X		
Implied						

Table 45. 1983, "Know" Most People Need to Believe that God Exists in Some Form of Higher Spiritual Being.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 46. 1983, "Know" This Spiritual Being has a Plan for the Universe.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 47. 1983, "Know" Many People Not Normally Religious Become So in the Time of War.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X		X		
Implied						

Table 48. 1983, "Know" The Danger of War Gives Rise to the Human Need to Believe that a Greater Spiritual Being is Guiding One's Fate.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied						

Table 49. 1983, “Know” In This Sense it Helps Soldiers to Believe They are Fighting for a Cause Right in the Eyes of their Religion.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

1983, “Do”

In terms of “Do” the author instructs: “Leaders, as well as chaplains, (Who) can assist soldiers by bolstering their spiritual strength and their conviction (How) that they are doing the moral thing (What).” Table 50 illustrates the content assessment.

Table 50. 1983, “Do” Leaders can Assist Soldiers by Bolstering Their Spiritual Strength.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				X
Implied						

1990

In 1983, FM 22-100 specifically used the terms religion, spirituality, or faith three times and strongly implied once that a religious leader can effectively motivate religious soldiers. It did not mention spirituality. The author uses the term religion as example of a belief:

Beliefs are assumptions or convictions you hold true about something, concept, or person. They can range from the very deep seated beliefs you hold concerning such things as *religion* and the fundamentals upon which this country was established (emphasis added).²¹

The second described Sergeant York's Battalion Commander, Major Buxton, as *religious*. The third addressed York's faith. Sergeant York determined after returning home that fighting for his country would not violate the precepts of his *faith*.

1990, "Be"

The author's use of the terms religion and faith were not relevant to "Be." For this reason, the investigator did not assess them using the content assessment.

1990, "Know"

The first use of the term religion informed readers that "Beliefs are assumptions or convictions(What) you (Who) hold true about something such as religion." Table 51 illustrates the content assessment.

Table 51. 1990, "Know" Beliefs are Assumptions or Convictions You Hold True about Something such as Religion.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Other term-uses repeat stated information published in 1983:

1. Major Buxton (Who) was very religious who knew the Bible (What) as well as Sergeant York.²²
2. Sergeant York (Who) determined he could fight for his country and not violate the precepts of his faith²³(What). Tables 52 and 53 show the respective content assessment matrices.

Table 52. 1990, “Know” Major Buxton was a Deeply Religious Man who Knew the Bible as Well as Sergeant York.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

Table 53. 1983, “Know” Sergeant York Determined He Could Fight for his Country and not Violate the Precepts of His Faith.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

As in the 1983 FM 22-100, the authors imply that leaders who “Know” about religion, are better able to lead soldiers who are religious, and again they cite the examples of the company commander and the battalion commander to demonstrate that those two leaders (Who) knew the nature and strength of York’s convictions (What) and how to lead Sergeant York (How). Table 54 depicts in content assessment matrix.

Table 54. 1990, (Implied) “Know” Knowledge of Religion can Enhance a Leader’s Ability to Lead Religious Soldiers.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified						
Implied	X	X				X

1990, “Do”

The term-uses of religion and faith printed in the 1990 FM 22-100 are not relevant to “Do”; therefore, the investigator did not complete a content assessment matrix for the classification “Do.”

1997

The draft 1997 FM 22-100 uses the term religious four times:

Regardless of their individual *religious* views, Army leaders must recognize the functional importance of the values and accept them for that reason. *Religious* toleration is one of the Constitutional principles. Leaders must always remember that *religious* choice is a private matter of individual conscience, too important for secular institutions to meddle with. It is enough for leaders to know that Army values are consistent with *religious* views (emphasis added).²⁴

The draft manual does not mention spirituality or faith.

1997, “Be”

None of the four uses of the term religion encourages or instructs leaders to “Be” religious; therefore, the investigator did not complete a content assessment for “Be.”

1997, “Know”

The author’s uses of the term religious that leaders should “Know” are:

1. Regardless of their individual *religious* views, Army leaders (Who) must recognize the functional importance of the values (What) and accept them for that reason (Why).
2. *Religious* toleration (What) is one of the Constitutional principles.
3. Leaders (Who) must always (When) remember that *religious* choice is a private matter of individual conscience, too important for secular institutions to meddle with (What).

4. It is enough for leaders (Who) to know that Army values are consistent with *religious* views (What). Tables 55 through 58 illustrate the content assessments.

Table 55. 1997, “Know” Regardless of Individual Religious Views.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X			X	
Implied						

Table 56. 1997, “Know” Religious Toleration is One of the Constitutional Principles.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified		X				
Implied	X					

Table 57. 1997, “Know” Leaders Must Always Remember that Religious Choice is a Private Matter.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X		X		
Implied						

Table 58. 1997, "Know" Army Values Are Consistent With Religious Values.

	Who	What	Where	When	Why	How
Specified	X	X				
Implied						

¹FM 22-10, 1951, 21.

²Ibid., 20.

³Ibid., 11-12.

⁴Ibid., 21.

⁵FM 22-100, 1953, 36.

⁶FM 22-100, 1958, 40.

⁷Ibid., 39.

⁸FM 22-100, 1961, 12

⁹Ibid., 14.

¹⁰Ibid., 30.

¹¹FM 22-100, 1965, 10

¹²Ibid., 14.

¹³Ibid., 12.

¹⁴FM 22-100, 1973, 2-9.

¹⁵Ibid., 3-2 - 3-3.

¹⁶Ibid., 6-3.

¹⁷Ibid., 5-7.

¹⁸FM 22-100, 1983, 111-112.

¹⁹Ibid., 127.

²⁰Ibid., 147.

²¹FM 22-100, 1990, 23.

²² Ibid., 26.

²³ Ibid., 26.

²⁴FM 22-100, (draft), 1997, 4-2.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSIONS WITH DOCTRINE AUTHORS AND EDITORS, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussions with Doctrine Authors and Editors

The investigator discussed the term-use changes found in three editions of FM 22-100 with Army officers who either authored or edited the sections of interest in the 1983, 1990, and 1997 (Initial Draft) FM 22-100 manuals. These discussions, although not an analytical research technique, provided the investigator insight into the Army's term-use changes. The investigator asked different questions of each officer because they worked independently on three different manuals. The following paragraphs include the investigator's questions and the authors' answers.

1983, Colonel Don Martin, USAR (Ret.), Contributing Editor, Chief Doctrine Branch, Research & Doctrine Assessment Directorate, Center for Army Leadership, Fort Leavenworth:

Colonel Don Martin contributed to the editing of the 1983 FM 22-100. He worked closely with the author, Lieutenant Colonel Mac Harris. Lieutenant Colonel Harris is now deceased.

Q. In 1983, FM 22-100 introduced two vignettes discussing Colonel Chamberlain and Sergeant York. What message did the Army want to convey about Chamberlain by mentioning his seminary schooling and Judeo-Christian values?

A. The author was convinced that strong faith in God makes leaders better, not that non-believers are not good leaders, but faith improves a leader's ability to lead.

Q. What message did the Army want to convey about Sergeant York and his religious convictions?

A. Essentially the same message that the Colonel Chamberlain story communicated, that faith in God improves a leader's ability. Sergeant York's story, like Colonel Chamberlain's, also informed the reader that technical and tactical expertise is also important to being a good leader. York's accomplishments were not only exciting, but they provided an example of an enlisted soldier in action to balance the story about Colonel Chamberlain.

Q. Why did the Army address: man's higher-level needs (spirit & soul), man's need for religion, and leaders, as well as chaplains assisting soldiers by bolstering their spiritual strength?

A. The investigator did not work with Lieutenant Colonel Harris on this particular extract. However, in 1983, the Army was very interested in Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. These paragraphs are consistent with behaviorist thinking. They are also consistent with Lieutenant Colonel Harris's thought that military leaders need to understand and recognize the power of faith whether they agree or do not agree with an individual's beliefs. Leaders should know how to incorporate that knowledge [about faith] in their leadership methodology.¹

1990, Lieutenant Colonel Keith Kettler USA (Ret.), Chief Doctrine Branch, Research & Doctrine Assessment Directorate, Center for Army Leadership, Fort Leavenworth:

Q. Why did the 1990 Sergeant York vignette omit two references to York's religion and York's comments to Captain Danforth regarding judgment day?

A. Those references were not singled out for omission; rather, the authors included them with others that were deleted to reduce the page count.

Q. Why did the 1990 FM 22-100 omit references to Chamberlain's religious training enhancing his character?

A. The authors questioned the accuracy of Chamberlain's seminary instruction and were not able to confirm that the statement regarding his seminary instruction was true.

Q. Why did the authors omit several paragraphs printed in 1983 that addressed human higher-level needs, and man's need for religion?

A. The Army, which previously referenced Maslow's hierarchy, now questioned its validity. Experience has shown that people do not always act in accordance with Maslow's linear hierarchy. The authors determined that the higher-level needs were abstract and most likely not well understood by junior leaders, the manual's intended audience. The authors removed all text that referenced or was associated with Maslow's model.

Q. Did the authors of the 1990 FM 22-100 receive guidance to down-play references to religion, spirituality, or faith?

A. No.²

1997 (Initial Draft), Lieutenant Colonel Tim Challans USA, Author, Concepts & Doctrine Directorate, Center for Army Leadership:

Q. The Army published eight field manuals in the FM 22-10/100 series during the period 1951 to 1990. All eight editions referenced religion, spirituality, or faith; however, in 1990 the Army seemed to down-play religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership doctrine. Is there, in 1997, an intentional effort to down-play religion, spirituality, or faith as elements of leadership?

A. Yes. Natural law captures the essence of most religions. Natural law would tell us what is right or wrong if God did not exist. Ethical principles should be universal and not absolute.

Q. From 1951 to 1983, FM 22-10/100 explained that religion, spirituality, and faith are important to many soldiers and that supporting religious activities is one technique of knowing your troops and taking care of their needs. Does the Army in 1997 disagree? Why doesn't the 1997 draft inform its readers that leaders should provide for the spiritual welfare of their men by supporting religious activities?

A. The Army does not disagree, but religion is a private matter. Officially encouraging leaders to support religious activities can create potential for abuse or undue influence of subordinates. Religious programs as such should be voluntary. Supporting religious programs too should be voluntary.

Q. The draft FM 22-100 states "Army leaders do not need to get 'wrapped around the axle' on questions of justification, where values 'come from.'" If the source of Army values is not known, will leaders recognize when their values have evolved away from the originating ideal?

A. Straying from the ideal is recognizable if actions are inconsistent with the values as they are defined.

Q. The 1994 FM 100-1, *The Army*, states that moral courage includes a spiritual dimension derived from religious values. Since FM 100-1 is the foundation for all Army doctrine, is the 1997 FM 22-100 at odds with FM 100-1?

A. Yes. TRADOC will revise FM 100-1.

Q. Does the 1997 FM 22-100 direct readers to Army values as a substitute for religion, spirituality, or faith?

A. No. Army values are not a substitute for religion, spirituality, or faith.³

Summary

This study reviewed U.S. Army leadership doctrine published since 1951. Specifically, the investigator reviewed the FM 22-10 and FM 22-100 manuals published from 1951-1990 and the FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) proposed for publishing in late 1997. The investigator's intent was to answer the question, how has U.S. Army leadership doctrine changed in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith since 1951? The research topic reflects the investigator's observation that the FM 22-100 printed in 1990 decreased the frequency of use of the terms religion and spirituality when compared with the 1983 FM 22-100.

Delimitations

The investigator researched U.S. Army leadership doctrine only and focused on the changes regarding the use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith. The research did not consider the merits of basing Army values on religious values nor did it endorse one religion or denomination.

Importance

The importance of this research is its identification and description of the changing nature of Army leadership doctrine relating to religion, spirituality, and faith. Specifically, it provides the reader with evidence that suggests the Army is decreasing its emphasis on religion, spirituality, and faith as aspects of leading and leadership. This research will serve as a reference for future discussions regarding the inclusion of religion, spirituality, or faith in Army leadership doctrine. The use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in leadership doctrine stirs debate within the Army. Some leaders believe that the Army should not address religion, spirituality, or faith as a

leadership element, others argue differently. The intent in conducting this research was identifying and describing objective information useful to a discussion of this issue.

The investigator's literature review and associated discussions suggested that this study was unique. Other known military research papers and publications discussed religion, spirituality, or faith as an aspect of Army ethics or values. No studies known to the investigator researched the changing nature or manner of the Army's use of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith. This study was timely. The Army's proponents of FM 22-100 at Fort Leavenworth released the latest revision of FM 22-100 as an initial draft in April 1997. It is possible that this study may offer those personnel reviewing the draft FM 22-100 insight into the issue of religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership.

Conclusions

Before answering the primary research question: "How has U.S. Army leadership doctrine changed in its use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith since 1951?" it was first necessary for the investigator to answer the subordinate research questions:

1. What is the frequency of use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the Army's FM 22-100 series publications between 1951 and 1997?

The Army used the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the FM 22-100 series forty-nine times during the period 1951 to 1990. The emerging doctrine 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) proposes using the term "religious" four times. The total term-use frequency, both published and proposed, is fifty-three. Tables 59 through 61 show the term-use frequency, by year.

Table 59. Frequency of Term-use "Religion," 1951 - 1997.

Term	1951	1953	1958	1961	1965	1973	1983	1990	1997	Total
Religion	1	1	1	3	3	7	8	3	4	31

Table 60. Frequency of the Term-use “Spirituality,” 1951 - 1997.

Term	1951	1953	1958	1961	1965	1973	1983	1990	1997	Total
Spirituality	1	0	1	6	6	1	5	0	0	20

Table 61. Frequency of the Term-use “Faith,” 1951 - 1997.

Term	1951	1953	1958	1961	1965	1973	1983	1990	1997	Total
Faith	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2

In the 1950s, the Army’s use of the term religion in FM 22-10 and FM 22-100 remained constant. The frequency increased however, each decade beginning in 1961, a trend that continued until 1983. In 1990, the frequency of use of “religion” decreased sharply. The 1997 (Initial Draft) edition of FM 22-100 proposes using the term religious four times. The Army’s frequency of use of “spirituality” in FM 22-100 fluctuated inconsistently during the period studied. It did not correspond with the frequency changes to the term religion. The Army did not introduce the term faith until 1983. The term appeared only once again in 1990.

2. What is the Army’s context and content for each use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the FM 22-100 series between 1951 and 1997?

In order to determine the Army’s context and content for each use of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith, the investigator first categorized the terms into one of three context classifications. These mutually exclusive classifications, “Be” “Know” and “Do” facilitated the investigator’s context assessment by providing distinguishable categories for each term use of religion, spirituality, or faith.

The investigator classified thirty-seven of the fifty-three published or proposed uses of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith, as “Know.” Almost seventy percent of the Army’s use of these terms in the FM 22-100 series was for the express purpose of communicating mostly general information regarding religion, spirituality, or faith to doctrine readers. The Army used the terms religion, spirituality, and faith to educate readers about the influence religion, spirituality, and faith have on soldiers’ behavior.

The investigator classified twelve of the fifty-three published or proposed uses of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith, as “Do.” Less than twenty-three percent of the occurrences of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith informed leaders that they should take action to facilitate either their own or a subordinate’s religion, spirituality, or faith.

The investigator classified four of the fifty-three occurrences of the Army using the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as “Be.” Placed in perspective, less than nine percent of the occurrences of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith informed leaders that they should adopt personal characteristics considered religious or spiritual.

Content assessment varied; the authors’ imparted messages using the terms religion, spirituality, or faith (term-use messages) did not provide answers to all of the content delineating questions. Forty-one of the authors’ fifty-three term-use messages relating to the context classifications “Be,” “Know” or “Do” specified the answers to the content delineating question “Who.” Seven of the fifty-three term-use messages implied answers to the same question. Forty-seven of the of the authors’ fifty-three term-use messages specified answers to the delineating question “What.” Four implied answers to that question. Five of the authors fifty-three term-use messages specified answers to the content delineating questions “Where,” likewise three specified

answered to "When," and seventeen specified answers to "Why." Two of the authors' fifty-three term-use messages specified answers to the question "How" and two others implied the answer.

Discussion

The Army has used the terms religion, spirituality, or faith in its leadership doctrine for more than forty-five years (1951 to 1996). This repetition of term use suggests to the investigator, that the Army has traditionally associated religion, spirituality, and faith with leadership. This perception was reinforced by the appearance of the terms religion, spirituality, or faith, in every FM 22-10 and FM 22-100 published. Major editorial changes to the frequency of terms-use might suggest that a small number of doctrine authors championed a cause and used the terms religion, spirituality, or faith to herald an opinion. The appearance of these terms in every FM 22-10 and FM 22-100 manual however, transcends the temporal sway of a few persuasive authors. This term use constancy is perhaps more telling than term use change.

Change is inherent in all organizations and doctrine exists to guide the Army through the turbulence of change. Emerging leadership doctrine today marks a change in the Army's context and content regarding the terms religion, spirituality, and faith as elements of leadership. The author of the 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) sections that address religion, spirituality, or faith clearly intends to disassociate Army values from religious values. His term-use message in doing so suggests to the investigator an intentional effort to exclude any discussion of religion, spirituality, or faith as elements of leadership. As presently written, the emerging doctrine ensures that developing leaders will not learn in FM 22-100 of the influence that religion, spirituality, and faith may have on many soldiers' behavior. The Army has used FM 22-100 for more than forty-five years as an instructional tool to educate leaders of the fact that religion, spirituality, and faith influence many soldiers; it behooves leaders to know so.

FM 22-100's term-use frequency changes correlate with periods of dramatic American social changes. This suggests to the investigator that the Army increased its emphasis on the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in leadership doctrine to help guide the organization through the confusion associated with the 1960s, the 1970s, and the early 1980s.

The investigator's context analysis indicates that FM 22-100 has not used the terms religion, spirituality, and faith to proselytize or advance religious views. The content assessment indicates that published authors of FM 22-100 offered leaders tremendous latitude by omitting details that might direct the location, timing, reason, or method of "Be"ing, "Know"ing, or "Do"ing something related to religion, spirituality, or faith. Further, only one-half of the Army's uses of the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in the FM 22-100 series were directly associated with the Army subset, leaders. The remaining terms addressed the needs of soldiers or discussed religion, spirituality, or faith in general.

Implications

The Army's changes to term use frequency and to term use context in particular suggests implications for the institution that require further study. The following issues deserve attention and warrant consideration as candidate topics for Army monographs, M.M.A.S. theses, or study papers:

1. The message imparted in the 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) admonishes leaders that the Army is a secular organization and religious choice is a private matter. Both points are accurate and factual. It also suggests that leaders should not be involved with their subordinates' expression of religion, spirituality, or faith. Such "fencing" of religion, spirituality, and faith would ensure leadership doctrine is secular; however, one could argue that it also constitutes an

endorsement of Humanism. What are the implications for the Army of adopting Humanism as an element of leadership?

2. Studies have shown that prayer and faith provide many soldiers a means to cope with the challenges of war. Changes that eliminate the Army's discussion of religion, spirituality, or faith in leadership doctrine may limit leader awareness of these soldier support mechanisms. How will the Army teach leaders the value of prayer and faith if leadership doctrine excludes the terms religion, spirituality, and faith?

3. One finding of the Department of the Army investigations into the Army's recent training-base sexual harassment scandals is training battalions were not authorized a chaplain. The presence of a chaplain in the effected units may have provided the mechanism to stop the harassment problem before it reached its present level. If emerging leadership doctrine is approved as presently proposed, will it create conflicts for soldiers or leaders who seek the advice of chaplains regarding failures in leadership?

4. Presently the Army's service schools have chaplains on the staff to provide students ethics instruction as part of the leadership program of instruction. The proposed changes in the 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft) would seemingly create a conflict for chaplains performing this duty as well as for the student leaders. Should the Army replace chaplains with other officers for the presentation of as ethics during leadership development classes?

Recommendations

The investigator recommends that senior Army leaders pause to reflect on the Army's tradition of discussing religion, spirituality, or faith in its leadership doctrine. Emerging doctrine emphasizes that Army values do not have their foundations in religious values and that religious choice is not merely a private matter, but too private to be considered by the Army.

Doctrinal discussions of religion, spirituality, and faith as leadership elements do not have to impose on such a private matter as religious choice. FM 22-100 can use the terms religion, spirituality, and faith in instructional discussions and still acknowledge that the Army is a secular organization. For more than four decades FM 22-100 has informed developing leaders that religion, spirituality, and faith influence many soldiers' behavior. Leaders who are aware that religion, spirituality, and faith can be powerful motivators possess useful knowledge. Senior leaders making decisions effecting leadership doctrine should, in the case of religion, spirituality, and faith, look to the past and consider the present before approving the proposed changes to FM 22-100 as written.

Proposed Narrative

The investigator proposes the following discussion of religion, spirituality, and faith for use in FM 22-100. Readers will note he took most of its content from published editions of FM 22-100. It does however, consider and support some of the arguments put forward by the 1997 FM 22-100 (Initial Draft). The investigator believes it a fair compromise.

From the beginning of recorded history, many people have shown a strong need to believe in God or a form of higher spiritual being. Soldiers normally want explanations for everything that happens and science cannot always provide the answer. Most people need to believe that God or some form of higher spiritual being exists and that this spiritual being has a plan for the universe and a purpose for the events that reason cannot explain. The danger and chaos of war give rise to the human desire to believe that a greater spiritual being is guiding one's fate for the best, regardless of whether one live or dies. Soldiers not normally religious often become so in time of war. This is an important source of motivation for soldiers. Leaders, as well as chaplains, can assist soldiers by recognizing their individual religious needs. The effective leader knows that for

some soldiers spiritual sources can provide an inherent strength. Leaders who thoroughly understand this power of spirituality and faith are better prepared to lead their soldiers. Leaders must realize their own character has an important influence on their subordinates. A leader's religious life, from this standpoint, may create qualities that serve as a bulwark producing stable qualities in subordinates. All leaders must remember however, that religious toleration is one of the Constitutional principles and that religious choice is a private matter of individual conscience.

¹Colonel Don Martin, Jr., US Army Reserve, Retired, telephone discussion with author, Ft Leavenworth, KS, 10 Mar 1997.

²Lieutenant Colonel Keith Kettler, US Army, Retired, telephone discussion with author, Ft Leavenworth, KS, 16 Mar 1997.

³Lieutenant Colonel Tim Challans, US Army, discussion with author, Ft Leavenworth, KS, 13 Mar 1997.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Covey, Stephen R. *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People: Powerful Lessons in Personal Change*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1989.

Hensman, Jake R. *Moral Bases—Theirs and Ours*, Moral Obligation and the Military. Washington: National Defense University Press, 1988.

Hunter, James Davison. *Culture Wars*. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Johnstone, William, J. *Robert E. Lee, The Christian*. Chicago: Abington Press, 1933

Keeton, William T. *Biological Science*. 2d ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1972.

Lamont, Corliss. *The Philosophy of Humanism*. 5th ed. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1965.

Matteson, Michael T., and John M. Ivancevich. *Managing Job Stress and Health: The Intelligent Person's Guide*. New York: The Free Press, 1982.

Mead, Frank S. *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*. 10th ed. Nashville: Abington Press, 1995.

Meyer, Majel. *Moral Standard For The New Age*. Washington: Vantage Press, 1974

National Research Council. *Psychology for the Fighting Man*. Washington: Penguin Books, 1944.

Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Senge, Peter M. *et al.* *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

Government Documents

U.S. Army. CGSC Student Text C710, *Senior-Level Leadership and the Art of Command*. Fort Leavenworth: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1996.

U.S. Army. FM 100-1, *The Army*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1994.

U.S. Army. FM 100-1, *The Army*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1991.

U.S. Army. FM 100-1, *The Army*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1986.

U.S. Army. FM 100-1, *The Army*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1981.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1990.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1983.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1973.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1965.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1961.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1958.

U.S. Army. FM 22-100, *Command and Leadership for the Small Unit*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1953.

U.S. Army. FM 22-103, *Leadership and Command at Senior Levels*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 1987.

U.S. Army. *Revised United States Army Regulations of 1861*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1863.

U.S. Army. ST 16-151, *The Army Character Guidance Program*. Fort Slocum, NY: The Chaplain School, 1951.

Other Sources

Barton, David. *America's Godly Heritage*. Aledo, TX: WallBuilders, Inc., 1992. Videocassette and Transcript.

Becker, John David. "Forward Into Battle: The Concept of Courage in Military Contexts." Master's Thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1989

Belt, David M. "Moral Integrity: The Real Center of Gravity." Report, Monterey, CA: Naval War College, 1989

Cramer, Walter E. "The Year of Values: Professional Military Values, Are They Relevant to Today's Society?" Study Project, U.S. Army War College, 1986.

Challans, Tim. LTC US Army. Interview by author, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 13 March 1997.

Edwards, Frederick. *The Promise Of Humanism (1989)*. Internet Infidels, 1996.

Heim, Robert L. "Leadership, Decision Making, and the Judeo-Christian Ethic." MMAS Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1993.

Hutcherson, Robert A. "The Vision Of Our Founding Fathers: One Nation Under God." Research Project, U.S. Army War College, 1995.

Institute in Basic Youth Conflicts. "Applying Basic Principles." Seminar Handout presented during a Basic Youth Conflicts convention, Kansas City, MO, 1984.

Kettler, Keith (LTC, Ret) Telephone Interview by Author. Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 16 March 1997.

Martin, Don(COL, Ret) Telephone Interview by Author. Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 10 March 1997.

Ray, James E. "Religion, National Character And Strategic Power." Report, U.S. Air War College Air University, 1985

Slotnick, Michael D. "Spiritual Leadership: How Does the Spirit Move You?" Master Military Art and Science Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1992.

Smith, Mason E. "Responsible Soldier's In The Nuclear Age: Inferences From The Catholic Bishop's Pastoral On Nuclear War." Master Military Art and Science Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1986.

VanAntwerp, R. L. "The Greatest Threat...Spiritual Decay." Research Project, U.S. Army War College, 1992.

U.S. Army, Center for Army Leadership. "FM 22-100 Army Leadership" Draft, Unedited (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Center for Army Leadership, 1997)

Wickam, John. Speech to CGSC Class, Ft. Leavenworth, KS. 1983.

Younquist, James H. "American Society vs U.S. Army Values: Direction of Society's Values and Implications for the 21st Century Army." Research Project, U.S. Army War College, 1996.

Periodicals and Journals

Challens, Tim. "Autonomy and Leadership." *Military Review* 76 (January-February 1996): 29-34.

Toner, James H. "Readings in Military Ethics." *Military Review*, 76 (January-February 1996): 35-42.

Brinsfield, John W. "The Chaplaincy and Moral Leadership." *The Army Chaplaincy*, PB 16-95-3 (July 1995): 3-27.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
1 Reynolds Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352

DTIC/OCH, J. Chiras
8725 John J. Kingman Rd. Suite 944
Ft Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Chaplain (LTC) Ronald R. Huggler
15 Stephan Rd.
Camp Hill, PA 17011

Camden Military Academy
ATTN: LTC (Ret.) Edwin L. Kennedy
Hwy 1
Camden, SC 29020

LTC (Ret.) George B. Kuykendall
16274 Ft. Riley Rd.
Leavenworth, KS 66048

COL Judith A. Bowers
2805 Home Place
Leavenworth, KS 66048

CERTIFICATION FOR MMAS DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

1. Certification Date: 06 / 06 / 97
2. Thesis Author: MAJ James E. Hilleary
3. Thesis Title: The Use of the Terms Religion, Spirituality, and Faith in Army Leadership Doctrine: Evolution and Change (1951 - 1997)

4. Thesis Committee Members Signatures:

Ronald R. Hugger CH(LTC) USA

Donald A. Bowers CO (C) AR

John Remond, LTC

George S. Kykewall, Ph.D.

5. Distribution Statement: See distribution statements A-X on reverse, then circle appropriate distribution statement letter code below:

A B C D E F X

SEE EXPLANATION OF CODES ON REVERSE

If your thesis does not fit into any of the above categories or is classified, you must coordinate with the classified section at CARL.

6. Justification: Justification is required for any distribution other than described in Distribution Statement A. All or part of a thesis may justify distribution limitation. See limitation justification statements 1-10 on reverse, then list, below, the statement(s) that applies (apply) to your thesis and corresponding chapters/sections and pages. Follow sample format shown below:

S	-----	SAMPLE	-----	SAMPLE	-----	S
A	<u>Limitation Justification Statement</u>	/	<u>Chapter/Section</u>	/	<u>Page(s)</u>	A
M						M
P	<u>Direct Military Support (10)</u>	/	<u>Chapter 3</u>	/	12	P
L	<u>Critical Technology (3)</u>	/	<u>Sect. 4</u>	/	31	L
E	<u>Administrative Operational Use (7)</u>	/	<u>Chapter 2</u>	/	13-32	E
<u>-----</u> SAMPLE <u>-----</u> SAMPLE <u>-----</u>						

Fill in limitation justification for your thesis below:

Limitation Justification Statement Chapter/Section Page(s)

7. MMAS Thesis Author's Signature:

J. E. Hilleary